

**BOARD WILL
LIMIT**

**CROWD AT
BEAVERS'**

**TRIAL FRIDAY
NIGHT**

Witnesses Will Be
Admitted

First and Then Only
Enough

Spectators to Fill the
Seats

Left Vacant.

HEARING TO
CONTINUE

IN RECORDER'S
COURT

Wild Scenes Mark Opening

Session Thursday Night

When Trial Suspends After

Hearing Four Witnesses

The trial of Police Chief Beavers, on Charges of insubordination and incompetency, will be resumed Friday night by the Board of Police Commissioners, in the Recorder's Court Room, at Police Station, with a reasonable assurance, that no further scenes of Disorder will be enacted.

Every effort will be made by the dominant Faction of the Commission to complete the trial at the sitting, and it is the

expectation that a verdict will be reached before adjournment, unless unforeseen Developments arise to delay matters.

Chairman William P. Fain has directed Acting Police Chief Mayo to station a couple of Officers at the entrance to the Recorder's Courtroom Friday night. These Officers will first admit persons holding Subpoenas as Witnesses, and after they have been comfortably provided for in the Hearing Chamber, the Officers will admit so many of the public as may comfortably be seated in the Room. There will be no crowding.

The acting Police Chief also has been instructed that no crowds shall be allowed to gather outside the Courtroom or Police Station, and that no disorder shall be tolerated on the streets.

"There is no good Reason why this trial of Chief Beavers should be prolonged or delayed unnecessarily," said Chairman Fain.

FAIR TRIAL ASSURED.

"A majority of the Board Membership is anxious that the Chief shall have every opportunity to make his Defense, and it is not proposed that the Hearing shall be delayed by outside interference. The public will be welcomed cordially to the meeting, but no disorder will be tolerated, and it is not intended that the Court Room shall be crowded to suffocation. The Room is amply large to accommodate all of the Witnesses that have been subpoenaed, and when they have been given seats, the Public will be allowed to occupy such others as may remain."

"Instructions have been given to Acting Chief Mayo to see that the Court Room is not overcrowded and that there is no Disorder outside the building."

“It is my idea that the trial can be easily concluded in one evening, and, as Chairman of the Board, I shall seek to expedite the Hearing, with a view to finishing it up before adjournment is taken.”

KEY’S STATEMENT.

James L. Key, of Counsel for Chief Beavers, on Friday morning declined “to show his hand” as regards his plans for Friday night, but he unhesitatingly discussed the Proceedings Thursday night, dictating this Statement to a Journal Reporter.

“The Circumstances surrounding the trial of Chief Beavers Thursday night made it the most unfair and savage performance it has been my lot to Witness. The Police Board did not accord to Chief Beavers and his Counsel as much consideration as any other Tribunal would have accorded a dirty Negro Sneak Thief. A fair trial under such conditions was physically impossible. I do not know to what extent the ‘frame-up’ extends in the Police Board, it is apparent that a large minority of the Board have convicted him in advance; in this it is possible I am mistaken. The Results will tell. If a majority have determined to lynch Chief Beavers, I see no Reason why they should go through even this miserable farce of a trial in order to accomplish it. If they dare lynch him and remove him from Office, this much can be said:”

“Removal from Office is a game that two sides can play at. The Police Board do not own their Offices, nor do they own the Police Department. Their places are subject to the demands of the Public at any time.”

The foregoing Statement by Mr. Key followed shortly upon a Conference he held with his Client, the accused Police Chief. The intimation contained in the Statement of a movement to recall the Members of the Police Board, in the event of Chief Beavers’

removal, was echoed elsewhere in the City by the friends of the suspended Officer.

THOMSON CRITICISISES BOARD.

Alderman Albert Thomson of the Fourth Ward was among the number who were outspoken in their criticism of the majority of the Police Board. The Alderman predicted that City Council would vote unanimously, almost, to abolish the Police Board. He said:

“A Charter Amendment would be re-

(Continued on Page Twelve, Col. 4.)

PDF PAGE 12, COLUMN 4

BEAVERS TRIAL CONTINUES FRIDAY

(Continued from Page One.)

quired to abolish the Board, however, and I fear that the Legislature will adjourn before it would be possible for us to amend the City Charter in this respect. The people are outraged, just the same, with ‘frame-up’ against Beavers, and those responsible for it will not be forgiven or forgotten.”

The Alderman added that he expected to attend the Session of the Police Board Friday night, though he would be “tardy,” due to another engagement earlier in the evening.

The majority Members of the Police Board appeared unconcerned regarding the claims and activities of the Chief and

his friends. Several of them accepted as correct a Report that one of the so-called Beavers Members of the Board had decided to vote to dismiss the Chief of Police, when the show-down came. They felt confident, too, that the plans of Chairman Fain to preserve Order and expedite the trial would prove successful and that a verdict would be reached Friday night before adjournment.

GOOD CHARACTER ADMITTED.

“The entire Membership of the Board should co-operate to uphold the hands of Chairman Fain in his efforts to preserve Order and to expedite the trial of Chief Beavers,” said Mayor Woodward. “The trial should be concluded in one evening, and, for one, I am going to work in harmony with the Chairman. I hope that other Members will do likewise.”

It is the view of the majority Membership of the Board that the trial should not require a great deal of time. They plan to admit as undisputed evidence the good Character and Personal and Official integrity of Chief Beavers. In this way, they calculate, that time will be saved by obviating the necessity for calling scores of Character Witnesses.

There was lots of talk Friday, regarding the Probability of appealing to the Court from the verdict of the Board, if the verdict is adverse, to Chief Beavers.

Members of the Board admit that any action they may take with regard to the Police Chief, or to any Officer in the Force, is subject to Court Review. The Chief of Police, if dismissed for inefficiency, insubordination, or any other Charge, may swear out a Writ of Certiorari and take the Case to the Superior Court. And either side might take the Case from the Superior Court to the Supreme Court.

But the Police Chief, if removed by the Board, will remain off the Force pending these Court Proceedings, which, it is stated, would require a couple of years.

THURSDAY'S SESSION.

At 8:25 o'Clock Thursday night the Board which had met in its Regular Room adjourned to the Recorder's Court and the Members, assisted by the Police, with difficulty forced a way through the crowd. Several Members were cheered when they walked on the rostrum. All of the other Commissioners were seated when Chairman W.P. Fain walked to his seat. He was both cheered and hissed.

"The Room will be cleared unless we have Order," he said.

Mr. Fain then announced that in view of the Fact that Chief Beavers had retained Counsel, Members of the Board had retained Charles T. Hopkins and Moore & Branch to advise the Board.

Commissioner Wardlaw asked if it was not the City Attorney's place to advise the Board. Before the question was answered Commissioner Vernoy arose and declared that he wanted to know who had retained the Attorneys.

Chairman Fain ruled him out of Order.

"I want it to go on the Record that the Commissioners employing these Attorneys are prosecuting Chief Beavers," declared Commissioner Vernoy.

"I want the Record to show who retained them and how much they were paid."

Commissioner Vaughan echoed Vernoy's Statement and vehemently added that he proposed to know what was going on. He was cheered by the crowd.

Mr. Vernoy, on his feet again, declared that if he had employed the Attorneys, he would be man enough to admit it.

Mr. Fain announced that the Board could try to override his Ruling.

James L. Key, the Leading Counsel for Chief Beavers, was on his feet at this time trying to make a Statement.

"Just a moment, Mr. Key," said the Chairman, but the Attorney's voice rose above considerable Disorder."

"Chief Beavers," he said, "has a right to know who his adversaries are. He has a right to know whether these gentlemen were employed by the Saloon League or the United Order of Lewd House Owners."

The question as put and three Members, Wardlaw, Vernoy, and Vaughan, voted to override the Chairman and permit the question of the employment of Attorneys and the amount of their fees. To sustain the Chair were Sisson, English, Pace, Clark, King, Holland, Johnson, Woodward, and Fain.

Later in the trial, Fain and Holland voted with the minority on different points, but the other seven Commissioners stayed solidly together.

W.T. Morris, Secretary to the Board, read the Charges against the Chief, which are as follows:

1. That said James L. Beavers, as Chief of Police of Atlanta, is grossly inefficient and incompetent.

2. The said James L. Beavers, as Chief of Police, after a long term of Office, has wholly failed to suppress a vast number of felonies and misdemeanors committed within the City of Atlanta, or to apprehend and arrest the Perpetrators thereof. The number of felonies committed and the percentages of those which have entirely escaped arrest being abnormal, without excuse, and to the grave injury of the public safety.

3. The said James L. Beavers, as Chief of Police, has not been able to obtain the Respect and Confidence of his subordinate Officers and Members of the Force, thereby rendering the Force ineffective.

4. Because the absence of respect, harmony and co-operation between said James L. Beavers, Chief of Police, and his Officers and the Force has resulted in rendering the Police Department inefficient, and to the detriment of the public good, peace and morals.

5. The said James L. Beavers, Chief of Police, has been guilty of insubordination, in that he has failed to obey the Instructions of the Board of Police or to comply with its Rules.

6. The said James L. Beavers, as Chief of Police, has been constantly conferring with and taking advice given by Private Citizens with Reference to the Management of the Police Department, in disregard of the Police Board and its Rules.

7. Because said Chief of Police has not devoted his Official time to the Discharge of his Official Duties, and has spent much of said time in Conference with Parties unofficially related to the Police Department, and in attending to matters connected with his Personal and Political Preferment, to the grave detriment of the public peace and safety.

Attorney George Westmoreland, of Counsel for Beavers, stated that he wished to file a demurrer before his Client pleaded to the Charge.

THE CHIEF'S DEMURRER.

The demurrer, principally on the ground that the Charges were nowhere specific, was as follows:

Now comes the Defendant and—

1. Demurs to the first Charge on the ground that said Charge is too vague and indefinite to be the basis of a trial and conviction; that said Charges should show wherein he has been inefficient and wherein he has been incompetent; that said Charge should specify the matters and things from which the conclusion has been drawn that he has been inefficient and incompetent; that said Charge should specify what duty he has failed to perform and what omission he has been guilty of that would justify the Charge that he is inefficient and incompetent, and Defendant moves to dismiss the Charge.

2. Defendant demurs to the second paragraph of the Charges against him and says that the same are too vague and indefinite to be the basis of the trial and conviction; that said Charge should specify how and wherein he has failed to suppress a vast number of felonies and misdemeanors committed in the City of Atlanta; that said Charge should specify in what manner it was within his power to suppress said felonies and misdemeanors and said Charge should specify what felonies and what misdemeanors that were committed and which he failed to suppress. The said Charge does not show that it was his Personal and individual duty to apprehend and arrest Perpetrators of Crime and does not show wherein he failed to use the instrumentalities in his Department to the best possible advantage in order to

apprehend and arrest Perpetrators of Crime; said Charge does not show wherein failure to make arrests is in any way chargeable to the Chief of Police and the Charge that failures of arrest have been abnormal, is too vague and indefinite to be the basis of a trial or conviction, and Defendant moves to dismiss Charge number two.

4. Defendant demurs to paragraph four of the Charges preferred and says that the same is insufficient to be the basis of a trial and conviction; said Charge fails to show wherein an absence of respect, harmony, and cooperation between said Chief of Police and his Officers and the Force is in any way chargeable to the Chief of Police and it fails to disclose what is the cause of this absence of respect, harmony, and cooperation and how or in what way said condition could be remedied by the Chief of Police in the exercise of proper skill and diligence and, therefore, Defendant prays that the Charge be dismissed.

5. Defendant demurs to the fifth charge against him upon the ground that the same is too vague and indefinite to be the basis of a trial and conviction; the said Charge fails to disclose what Instructions of the Board of Police, the Chief of Police failed to obey, and fails to disclose what rule or rules of the Board the Chief of Police failed to obey; that said Charge fails to set forth the time the circumstance of said failure to obey or failure to comply with the rules of the Board and, therefore, Defendant prays that said Charge be dismissed.

6. Defendant demurs to paragraph six of the Charges and says that the same is too vague and indefinite to be the basis of a trial and conviction. He says further that the same is insufficient, to be a basis of a trial and conviction. He further demurs to said paragraph and says that the same does not set forth what Private Citizens the Chief of Police has been conferring with and taking

advice from, nor does it set forth what they were conferring about, nor does it set forth what the advice was, nor does it set forth any Rules or Reasons why Private Citizens cannot confer with their Chief of Police, if they so desire, nor does said Charge specify any Rule, Order or Instruction of the Board, which it is claimed has been violated in this Case, nor does said Charge specify the time, place or circumstance of the violation of any Rule of the Board and, therefore, Defendant prays that said Charge be dismissed.

7. Defendant demurs to paragraph seven of the Charges and says that said Charge is too vague and indefinite to be the basis of a trial and conviction. He says that said Charge should specify what time he has failed to give to the Police Department that he should have given; that said Charge should set forth what Parties the Police Chief was in Conference with and in what respect the Conference was hurtful or injurious to the Department. Said Charge should set forth what matters connected with his Personal and Political Preferment the Chief has been attending to during the official time and in what respect this conduct has been hurtful and injurious to the Department; that said Charge should set forth what the matters are that the Chief has been attending to and what the Personal and Political Preferment was that the Chief had been connected with and in what respects all these matters have been detrimental to the public Peace and Safety, and, therefore, Defendant prays that this Charge be dismissed.

And now, therefore, Defendant prays that all of the several Charges against him in this case be dismissed, upon the several grounds stated.

Mr. Westmoreland declared that he did not wish to be technical further than the rules of law required but that there

were no Specifications in the Charges, no Names, Dates, or Acts or anything that a Defendant could intelligently answer.

“We simply ask a fair trial for a man who has spent his life in the service of the City and has risked his life for the City,” said Mr. Westmoreland.

“We ask only for something definite that we can answer. We ask nothing that the lowest criminal in Georgia couldn't ask and get. Give us some time and place and circumstances—don't let it all stay in the air.”

“A DIRTY LIAR.”

Attorney Charles T. Hopkins arose to answer the demurrer.

“First I want to reply to the inquiry as to who produced us here, by saying that any man, whoever he is, who says we are the Representatives of any Lewd House Owners or liquor interest is a dirty liar.”

Ruled out of Order by Chairman Fain, Mr. Hopkins took up the demurrer;

“This demurrer is written in a peculiar spirit. It assumes that this job belongs to the Beavers; that to hold it is a God-given Right and to Charge inefficiency is a Crime.”

“The Proposition of Private Ownership of a job like this is settled by the Gray and McClendon Case.”

“Also, the question of pleading is immaterial. The question of a Formal Charge is settled in the McQueen Case which this Board tried years ago.”

“If this job is a God-given one, then your body has no usefulness as a Court.”

Mr. Hopkins took his seat on a crowded Table, and Walter McElreath, of Counsel for Beavers, said:

“It is a Basic Principle of Law that the Charge must contain those specifications which permit his removal. We are willing for him to be tried, but he should be tried as well as a Negro is tried in Judge Calhoun's Court.”

Commissioner Johnson moved to overrule the demurrer.

Mayor Woodward took the floor for the time and declared that the Charges were made-up from the Report of the investigating committee, formulated after several months of study of the Department.

He read from the Rule Book a list of Charges on which Police may be discharged and when he came to the specification of insubordination, “If there hasn't been plenty of disrespect and insubordination in his conduct, I would like to know what insubordination is.”

Mr. McElreath: “When was this insubordinate?”

Woodward: “Here last Monday night and he ought to have been fired then for it.”

McElreath: “Why, you might as well try me for that. He was suspended and not an Officer.”

Hopkins: “Why, that's been decided by the Supreme Court.”

Key: “At any rate, that was only a Personal controversy between an Officer and the individual Members of the Board.”

“When is a Board Member a Superior Officer to the Chief of Police?”

Fain: “We elect him.”

“Is a Member of Council your Superior Officer?” asked Key.

“Yes,” the Chairman answered.

Commissioner Clark: “All that’s Out of Order, the Board was in Session Monday and each Member the Chief’s Superior.”

Key: “Why, he was out of it then. His place had been filled.”

DEMURRER IS OVERRULED.

Commissioner Fain interrupted and put Commissioner Johnson’s motion to Overrule the demurrer. Eight Commissioners, as follows, voted to Overrule: Sisson, English, Pace, Clark, King, Johnson, Woodward, and Holland, who explained that he cast his Ballot to override demurrer, because he desired the Charges to be thoroughly sifted.

Commissioner Fain voted with the three consistent Beavers Supporters. Wardlaw, Vernoy, and Vaughan.

When the vote on the demurrer was taken, it was past 9 o’Clock, and Chairman Fain turned to the Defendant and said:

“Guilty or not guilty?”

Chief Beavers rose and in a firm voice said: “Not guilty on a single count.”

At this point Alderman John S. Owens forced his way to the Lawyers’ Table and addressing the Board said:

“I am here under Subpoena, and I am in torture as are several hundred other people. I beg you to adjourn to some place where there is more Room, and more air.”

Councilman J.C. White added his voice. “There are men in this Room who are fainting and sick. The trial should not continue

here. The people want to hear it, and they should have that right.”

Both Speakers were greeted by prolonged cheers and cries of “Auditorium, Auditorium.”

Commissioner Holland made a motion to adjourn to the Auditorium. Councilman White launched into a speech urging that the Board adjourn and give the people the right to comfortably hear the trial.

Mayor Woodward took the floor to declare that neither Dr. White nor Mr. Owens had the right to address the Commission, except by its invitation.

“Gentlemen,” said Mayor Woodward, “we are not responsible for the crowd, and I for one am not willing to join in to make a Spectacle of this trial. Judge Roan, in the Frank trial, refused a similar request, though his Courtroom was hardly any larger than this. We must uphold the dignity of this body by meeting in our regular place.”

Commissioner Johnson attempted to speak and was hissed.

Attorney Key urged that under the conditions prevailing it was physically impossible to give Beavers a fair trial.

There was more discussion, and much Disorder in the crowd gained the impression that the trial had been adjourned to the Auditorium. By the time a vote was actually taken against adjourning to the Auditorium, a large part of the crowd had left, and even the Attorneys for the Commission, Mr. Hopkins and Moore & Branch, were under the misapprehension that the trial was to be continued in the Auditorium, and left for that place.

After a few minutes, it began to appear that the Board wouldn't go to the Auditorium after all, and a sufficient crowd to leave the Court Room packed, stayed with the Board.

An effort was made to clear the space inside the railing, and chairman Fain announced that the trial would proceed. Then the absence of the Attorneys was noted, and the session was delayed half an hour until they returned.

Mr. Hopkins opened the new Session by asking if he had understood the Chairman to Rule that each side was limited to one hour.

Chairman Fain read Rule 150 of the Police Manual, limiting Cases to one hour, but when Mr. McElreath called attention to the Fact that Chief Beavers is answering seven Charges, it was agreed that under it he might claim seven hours and the trial proceeded without definite action on the point.

FIRST WITNESS CALLED.

Mr. Hopkins called Charles G Cohen, Night Clerk to the Chief to the Stand, and Cowan testified that, at Mr. Hopkins' instance, he compiled from the Records a Report showing that during the last 12 months 4,802 Burglary, Robbery, and Larceny Cases have been reported to the Police, and charged with these Crimes, only 978 people have been bound over to the higher Courts..

"Does that mean," questioned Mr. Hopkins, "3,824 Crimes have gone unpunished?"

"I wouldn't say that, because some of the Defendants have been charged with 8 or 10 different Crimes."

"There are no murders on this list?"

"No."

“You simply omitted the unessential item of murder.”

The Witness smiled.

“Well, there is one murderer, called Jack the Ripper at large, isn’t there?”

“I don’t know.”

“Well at any rate there is a Criminal, who has killed fifteen or twenty Negro women.”

“I don’t know that.”

Mr. Key took up the Cross-Examination.

“Where do you find these Cases?”

“They are on the Records—the lookout book.”

“Aren’t there a good many fakes on that book?”

“Quite a few.”

“And your Record doesn’t show how many of these Cases were investigated and proven fakes?”

“No.”

“Does this list include Cases disposed of in the Recorder’s Court and not sent to the Higher Courts?”

“It does not.”

“Do you know any Reason why these matters should be charged to Beavers?”

“I do not.”

Alderman Owens, who by this time had gotten back from the Auditorium, was at the Head of a number of Citizens and forced

his way into the inclosure. "I have come back as Chairman of a Committee appointed by several hundred outraged Citizens, whom you invited to the Auditorium."

"They feel outraged and I feel outraged by your conduct."

Commissioner Vaughan moved to adjourn to meet at 8 o'clock Friday night at the Auditorium. Vernoy seconded the motion. Mayor Woodward declared that he was not disposed to make a farce of the trial by holding it at the Auditorium, and announced that he opposed any move, from the Court Room.

The vote for the motion was: Wardlaw, Vernoy, Vaughan, Holland, Fain—5. Against the motion: Sisson, English, Pace, Clark, King, Johnson, Woodward—7.

SAYS CASE IS PREJUDGED.

Alderman Owens said:

"I will go back to the outraged people whom I represent and tell them that I believe this Case has been prejudged and your verdict made."

The Statement was wildly cheered.

"I further put you on notice," said the Alderman, "that I don't propose, to be made to stay here and suffer further. I am leaving now and will most probably call a Physician."

Although it was almost suffocating in the Room, there were cries from seated Spectators of "Take him out."

Alderman Thomson, who came in with Mr. Owens' delegation, said:

"I, too, want to protest for myself and other outraged Citizens. You led us to the Auditorium. It has been charged that

this Case has been framed up. And now I believe it. You are trying to frame the people like you have Beavers, but you will never get away with it.”

The crowd, back from the Auditorium, successfully rushed the Police.

“Come on, boys,” yelled many of the Spectators on the inside.

After a time, Order was restored and another motion to adjourn until Friday was put and lost by the same vote of 7 to 5.

Mr. Key continued the Cross-Examination of Secretary Cowan:

“There have been many References in the Papers to these alleged Crimes?”

“Yes.”

“Don’t these things bring on Crime Waves?”

“I don’t know.”

“There are many Cases dropped by the Prosecutors themselves?”

“Yes.”

“Do you know of a single omission on the part of Chief Beavers?”

“No.”

Mr. Hopkins on redirect:

“These Records are for the past two months since Marion Jackson has been publishing his Bulletins, aren’t they?”

The question was ruled out.

“Don’t the Bulletins show Atlanta as a Haven of Refuge for crooks?”

Again, the question was ruled Out of Order.

“Never mind,” said Mr. Hopkins, “we will just leave that to the figures.”

REPORTER IS QUESTIONED.

C. E. Doremus, Police Reporter for *The Journal*, was the next Witness.

In substance, he testified on direct Examination that in his opinion, there is a lack of efficiency in the entire Department, and that 85 per cent of the men do not properly respect the Chief.

Over the objection of Beavers’ Counsel, he testified as to the occurrences in the Commissioners’ Room last Monday, when Chief Beavers was suspended.

Mr. Key took up the Cross-Examination:

“Chief Beavers didn’t say anything about the Board Members that was not true, did he?”

The crowd cheered the question, but the Witness answered that he didn’t know the Records of the Members of the Board.

Replying to questions, the Witness said that he has worked “Police” for Papers in Augusta, Macon, and Atlanta.

The Witness said he had been in the Newspaper “game” ten years.

Key: “Your game is to look for sensations, isn’t it?”

“I look for Facts.”

"Well, you like to get a story for the Front Page with big Headlines?"

"I do."

"And you are always trying to get a scoop to put it over the other fellow?"

"I do it."

"Well, you have to get these scoops to be a Success?"

"Yes."

"And you are a Success?"

"Oh yes, I admit it," replied the Witness, causing a general laugh.

"You say you find a lack of Harmony in the Department?"

"I do, considerable."

"And more than in the Police Board?"

"Well, I find both interesting."

"Name the 85 per cent of the Force that hasn't respect for the Chief."

"I am not going to give you any names."

"I demand them."

"Well, I am not going to give them to you."

Chairman Fain ruled that the Reporter did not have to answer. Asked how he knew that the men were not in Sympathy with the Chief, Mr. Doremus answered that on the nights the Board met, he would be asked by many Policemen if he thought the Board would "get the Chief that night."

"I hope they do," he said was a stereotyped Statement by many men on the Force.

Archie Lee, City Hall Reporter for the Atlanta Georgian, was the next Witness, and he stated that it is evident that the Chief is not in Sympathy with the Board as a Superior Authority.

LACK OF DISCIPLINE.

He said that there were evidences of a lack of Discipline in the Department; a lack of coordination and an evident Friction between the Police and Detective Departments.

He also detailed Monday night's scene at the Board Meeting, saying the Chief had begun by assuming that the Charges were the Result of Cases made against Locker Clubs. He called the attack on the Mayor, a tirade, and said that the Chief completely lost his temper. He said that it looked for a time as if Beavers would be arrested.

Cross-Examined by Mr. Key, the Witness was asked if he was an Expert on the running of a Police Department.

"It doesn't take an Expert to point out the flaws here," he answered.

"Your Paper has made a Feature of Crime Waves?"

"We have published many Complaints about Crime."

"Haven't you made it more of a Specialty since the Men and Religion people withdrew their Bulletins from your Paper and you unsuccessfully solicited them?"

The question was ruled out.

The Witness said that he was formerly Secretary of the Citizens League. When Board Members attempted to have ruled

out questions about the objectives of the League Mr. Key said, "I want to show that it is the purpose of this man and his Paper to undo Beavers."

The Witness said the object of the Citizens League was simply good Government.

"Referring to your Paper, didn't you say before the investigating Committee, that 'we will carry on the fight against Beavers until he loses out'?"

"The Statement was qualified," answered the Reporter.

W.T. Morris, Secretary to Chief Beavers, followed Mr. Lee and was the last Witness at the Session:

In substance Mr. Morris testified that while he had been Secretary to the Chief for seven years, serving under Chief Jennings, also, that he had never known Beavers to fail to perform "his duty as he saw it." The Chief, he says, was loyal to his Office.

He refused to answer a question as to whether Beavers was as efficient as any Chief he had ever served under. He testified that Beavers recommended a decrease in the Detective Force.

He said that the size of the City, both in territory and population, had grown more rapidly than the Department, rendering the work more difficult.

When Morris was excused, a motion was made to adjourn to meet at the Auditorium, Friday, but this was lost 7 to 5. A motion simply to adjourn was carried at midnight.
